

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Summary of the Office Action**

In the final Office Action mailed on June 8, 2009, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement for claims 37-40 and indicated a constructive election of the remaining claims.

Additionally, the Examiner allowed claim 23. And the Examiner objected to claims 17-19 and 32 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating this allowable subject matter.

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 5, 7, 10, 15-16, 20-22, 26, 30-31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0131387 (Pitcher) in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0134638 (Sundar), the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitcher in view of Sundar in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,177,636 (Oda), the Examiner rejected claims 12-13 and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitcher in view of Sundar in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0002335 (Pan), and the Examiner rejected claims 14 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitcher in view of Sundar in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0085516 (Bridgelall). The Examiner also objected to claims 34-36 due to informalities.

### **2. Summary of the Claims**

In this response, Applicant has withdrawn claims 37-40 and amended claims 5, 10, 23, 34, and 36. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11, and 24 had previously been cancelled.

Now pending are claims 5-7, 10, 12-23, and 25-40, where claims 7, 10, 23, 34, and 37 are independent and the remainder are dependent. The amendments to the claims are generally supported by the specification.

### **3. Response to Restriction Requirement**

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement for claims 37-40 and indicated a constructive election of the remaining claims. In response, Applicant elects the remaining claims without traverse and accordingly withdraws claims 37-40. Applicant reserves

the right to file continuation and/or divisional application(s) to pursue patenting of the subject matter of the withdrawn claims.

#### **4. Response to Objections to Claims 34-36**

The Examiner objected to claims 34-36 due to informalities. Specifically, the Examiner stated that “[c]laims 34-36 use the acronym ‘TCP’. It would be more clarifying if the first instance of the acronym were spelled out with the acronym following in parenthesis.” Office Action, p. 11.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 34 and 36 to recite a “wireless-LAN” connection and removed mention of a “TCP” connection. The acronym “LAN” is spelled out in claim 34, which recites in part “registering a mobile terminal via a wireless local area network (LAN)”.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections due to informalities of claims 34-36.

#### **5. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

As mentioned above, the Examiner objected to previous claim 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this response, Applicant has amended independent claims 7, 10, and 34 to recite much of the subject matter of previous claim 17. As such, Applicant submits that each of the independent claims 7, 10, and 34 are now allowable.

Further, Applicant submits that each of the dependent claims 5-6, 12-22, 25-33, and 35-36 are allowable as well for at least the reason that each of the dependent claims ultimately depends from an allowable independent claim; that is, either claim 7, 10, or 34.

**6. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits all claims are allowable and respectfully requests notification of the allowance of this application. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3338.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: September 8, 2009

By: /Thomas J. Loos/  
Thomas J. Loos  
Reg. No. 60,161